



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/995,779

11/29/2001

Hideki Isohata

122.1477

1716

21171

7590

11/19/2004

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

QUARTERMAN, KEVIN J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2879

DATE MAILED: 11/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No. 09/995,779	Applicant(s) ISOHATA ET AL.	
	Examiner Kevin Quarterman	Art Unit 2879	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 25 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☒ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-26.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicant has amended several claims adding a limitation that the recesses/holes are "isolated." This limitation was not previously presented and would, therefore, require further consideration and/or search.

The Examiner also notes that it is unclear as to what applicant means by the term "isolated", since the term is nowhere mentioned in the specification and the drawings does not clearly show what is meant by the term. Thus, the Examiner notes that the addition of the term "isolated" raises the issue of new matter.

In response to applicant's argument that the lower surface of the main frame of Isohata does not contact the adhesive tapes, the Examiner notes that the claims of the instant application does not require that the lower surface of the main frame contact the adhesive tapes.

In response to applicant's argument that the screw holes of Isohata are not provided where the adhesive tapes are fixed, the Examiner notes that Figure 5A of Isohata shows the adhesive tape (1a) formed on the entire surface of the heat-conduction plate (18). Since the screw holes (7) of the main frame are matched up with the sockets (6) of the heat-conduction plate, the Examiner holds that the screw holes of Isohata are provided where the adhesive tapes are fixed.

In response to applicant's argument that Isohata has no description relating arranging air bubbles regularly at an adhesive portion, the Examiner notes that those features are not stated in the claims. Although claims of an application are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. It is the claims that are anticipated or unpatentable, not the specification.

In response to applicant's argument that Isohata does not disclose an adhesive tape having recesses, the Examiner notes that Figures 5A-C show the adhesive tapes (1b, 1c) having recesses (the area between adjacent strips).

W

Joseph Williams
Joseph Williams